arXiv:1006.3000v1 [math.PR] 15 Jun 2010

NORMAL FORMS APPROACH TO DIFFUSION NEAR HYPERBOLIC EQUILIBRIA

SERGIO ANGEL ALMADA MONTER AND YURI BAKHTIN

Abstract. We consider the exit problem for small white noise perturbation of a smooth dynamical system on the plane in the neighborhood of a hyperbolic critical point. We show that if the distribution of the initial condition has a scaling limit then the exit distribution and exit time also have a joint scaling limit as the noise intensity goes to zero. The limiting law is computed explicitly. The result completes the theory of noisy heteroclinic networks in two dimensions. The analysis is based on normal forms theory.

1. Introduction

Small stochastic perturbations of continuous deterministic dynamical systems have been studied intensively for several decades. One of the greatest achievements in the area is the celebrated Freidlin–Wentzell (FW) theory that allows to explain long-term behavior of systems with several meta-stable states at the level of large deviation estimates [6].

An interesting situation where one can prove more precise estimates than those provided via FW quasi-potential approach was considered by Kifer [9]. He studied the exit problem for small noise perturbations of a deterministic system in a neighborhood of a hyperbolic fixed point (or, saddle) in $\mathbb{R}^d$ assuming that the starting point for the diffusion belongs to the stable manifold of the fixed point. Kifer showed that as the noise level ϵ decays to 0, the diffusion tends to exit along the invariant manifold associated to the leading eigenvalue λ_+ of the linearization of the system even in the presence of other unstable directions. He also found that the random exit time τ_ϵ is asymptotic in probability to $\lambda_+^{-1}\ln\epsilon^{-1}$.

When studying noisy perturbations of systems with heteroclinic networks, i.e., multiple saddle points connected by heteroclinic orbits, Bakhtin [2],[4], realized that to understand the vanishing noise behavior of the system, one has to extend Kifer's work and analyze (i) the limiting distribution of the approximation error $\tau_\epsilon - \lambda_+^{-1}\ln\epsilon^{-1}$; (ii) the limiting scaling laws of the exit distribution for the neighborhood of each saddle. In fact, the exit distribution for the first saddle point serves as the entrance distribution for the next saddle point, so that the peculiarities of the exit distribution can significantly influence the further evolution of the system.

The detailed analysis of scaling limits for distributional Poincaré maps near saddle points carried out in [2] resulted in a complete theory for noisy heteroclinic networks. This theory explains interesting non-Markovian limit effects and the emerging patterns in the winnerless competion in the process of sequential decision making (here, we are using the terminology from [11] where applications of heteroclinic networks to neural dynamics are considered). The main result is that under the logarithmic time scaling the diffusion process converges in distribution in a special topology to a precisely described limiting process that jumps between the saddles along the heteroclinic connections.

The core result that was applied in [2] iteratively for sequences of saddle points connected to one another, is a lemma that computes the asymptotic scaling of the exit distribution for a neighborhood of a saddle point given the scaling of the entrance distribution. The proof of that lemma was based on a coordinate change conjugating the driving drift vector field to a linear vector field. Although this method and the lemma based on it apply in a fairly generic situation where the so called no-resonance condition holds, there are interesting cases such as Hamiltonian dynamics where the smooth linearization is not possible due to resonances. In these cases, the system remains nonlinear even under the optimal smooth change of coordinates, but it has a certain special structure that can be studied using the classical theory of normal forms (see, e.g., [5],[7],[10]).

In this paper, we extend the key lemma of [2] to cover the resonant cases and, in fact, to the complete generality in the case $d = 2$. Our approach is based on normal forms that have particularly nice structure in the 2-dimensional case. We believe that the main result of the present paper can be extended to higher dimensions.

An important consequence of our result is that in 2 dimensions the no-resonance restriction is completely removed from the theory of noisy heteroclinic networks developed in [2], so that the theory applies to any heteroclinic networks generated by smooth vector fields on the plane. It also provides a generalization of [3] and [9] in 2 dimensions.

The structure of the paper is the following. In Section 2 we introduce the setting. In Section 3 we state the main theorem and split the proof into several parts. In Section 4 we introduce a simplifying change of coordinates in a small neigborhood of the saddle point. The analysis of the transformed process in Section 5 is based upon two results. Their proofs are given in Sections 6 and 7.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to Vadim Kaloshin for his advice on normal forms and for pointing to [7]. The work of Yuri Bakhtin is supported by NSF through a CAREER grant DMS-0742424.

2. SETTING

Let us consider a C^∞-smooth vector field b on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and a C^2-smooth matrix valued function $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2}$. Let W be a standard 2-dimensional Wiener process. In order to ensure that the stochastic Itô equation

$$dX_\epsilon = b(X_\epsilon)dt + \epsilon\sigma(X_\epsilon)dW \tag{1}$$

has a unique global strong solution, our first assumption is that both b and σ are Lipschitz and bounded, i.e., there is a constant $L > 0$ such that

$$|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)| \vee |b(x) - b(y)| \le L|x - y|, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$
$$|\sigma(x)| \vee |b(x)| \le L, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm for vectors and Hilbert–Schmidt norm for matrices. These conditions can be weakened, but we prefer this setting to avoid multiple localization procedures throughout the text. For a general background on stochastic differential equations see, for example, [8].

We shall denote by $S = (S^t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ the flow generated by b:

$$\frac{d}{dt}S^t x = b(S^t x), \quad S^0 x = x.$$

Let V be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with piecewise C^2 boundary. We assume that the origin 0 belongs to V and it is a unique fixed point for S in $\bar{V}$, or, equivalently, a unique critical point for b in $\bar{V}$. Therefore,

$$b(x) = Ax + Q(x),$$

where $A = Db(0)$ and Q is the non-linear part of the vector field satisfying $|Q(x)| = O(|x|^2)$, $x \to 0$.

We assume that 0 is a hyperbolic critical point, i.e. the matrix A has two eigenvalues λ_+ and $-\lambda_-$ satisfiying $-\lambda_- < 0 < \lambda_+$. Without loss of generality, we suppose that the canonical vectors are the eigenvectors for the matrix, so that $A = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_+, -\lambda_-)$.

According to the Hadamard–Perron Theorem (see e.g. [10, Section 2.7]), the curves $\mathcal{W}^s$ and $\mathcal{W}^u$ defined via

$$\mathcal{W}^s = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |S^t x| \to 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}^u = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |S^t x| \to 0 \text{ as } t \to -\infty\}$$

are smooth, invariant under S and tangent to e_2 and, respectively, to e_1 at 0. The curve $\mathcal{W}^s$ is called the stable manifold of 0, and $\mathcal{W}^u$ is called the unstable manifold of 0.

We assume that $\mathcal{W}^u$ intersects ∂V transversally at points q_+ and q_- such that the segment of $\mathcal{W}^u$ connecting q_- and q_+ lies entirely inside V and contains 0.

We fix a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{W}^s \cap V$ and equip (1) with the initial condition

$$X_\epsilon(0) = x_0 + \epsilon^\alpha \xi_\epsilon, \quad \epsilon > 0, \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ is fixed, and $(\xi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ is a family of random vectors independent of W, such that for some random vector ξ_0, $\xi_\epsilon \to \xi_0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$ in distribution.

If $\alpha \neq 1$, then we impose a further technical condition

$$\mathbf{P}\{\xi_0 \parallel b(x_0)\} = 0, \tag{3}$$

where $\parallel$ denotes collinearity of two vectors.

We are studying the exit problem for the diffusion process X_ϵ in V. We are interested in the asymptotic distribution of the random point of exit of X_ϵ from V given by $X_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon^V)$, where τ_ϵ^V is the stopping time defined by

$$\tau_\epsilon^V = \tau_\epsilon^V(x_0) = \inf\{t > 0 : X_\epsilon(t) \in \partial V\}.$$

3. Main Result.

The main result of the present paper is the following:

Theorem 1. *In the setting described above, there is a family of random vectors $(\phi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$, a family of random variables $(\psi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$, and a number*

$$\beta = \begin{cases} 1, & \alpha\lambda_- \geq \lambda_+ \\ \alpha\frac{\lambda_-}{\lambda_+}, & \alpha\lambda_- < \lambda_+ \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

such that

$$X_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon^V) = q_{\mathrm{sgn}(\psi_\epsilon)} + \epsilon^\beta \phi_\epsilon.$$

The random vector

$$\Theta_\epsilon = \left(\psi_\epsilon, \phi_\epsilon, \tau_\epsilon^V + \frac{\alpha}{\lambda_+}\ln\epsilon\right)$$

converges in distribution as $\epsilon \to 0$.

The distribution of ψ_ϵ,ϕ_ϵ, and the distributional limit of Θ_ϵ will be described precisely.

The proof of Theorem 1 has essentially three parts involving the analysis of diffusion (i) along $\mathcal{W}^s$; (ii) in a small neighborhood of the origin; (iii) along $\mathcal{W}^u$.

The first part is based on a Theorem borrowed from [2, Lemma 9.2]. To state the theorem, we need to introduce $\Phi_x(t)$ as the linearization of S along the orbit of $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, i.e. we define $\Phi_x(t)$ to be the solution to the matrix ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi_x(t) = A(t)\Phi_x(t), \;\; \Phi_x(0) = I,$$

where $A(t) = Db(S^t x)$. The theorem reads as:

Theorem 2. *Let* $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ *and* $(\xi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ *be a family of random vectors independent of* W *and convergent in distribution, as* $\epsilon \to 0$, *to* ξ_0. *Suppose* $\alpha \in (0,1]$ *and let* X_ϵ *be the solution of the SDE* (1) *with initial condition* $X_\epsilon(0) = x + \epsilon^\alpha \xi_\epsilon$. *Then, for every* $T > 0$, *the following representation holds true:*

$$X_\epsilon(T) = S^T x + \epsilon^\alpha \bar{\xi}_\epsilon, \quad \epsilon > 0,$$

where

$$\bar{\xi}_\epsilon \xrightarrow{Law} \bar{\xi}_0, \quad \epsilon \to 0,$$

with

$$\bar{\xi}_0 = \Phi_x(T)\xi_0 + \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha=1\}}N,$$

N being a Gaussian vector:

$$N = \Phi_x(T)\int_0^T \Phi_x(s)^{-1}\sigma(S^s x)dW(s).$$

If $\alpha = 1$ *or assumption* (3) *holds, then* $\mathbf{P}\{\bar{\xi}_0 \parallel b(S^T x)\} = 0$.

The second part of the analysis is the core of the paper. Theorem 3 below describes the behavior of the process in a small neighborhood U of the origin. Notice that since $x_0 \in \mathcal{W}^s$, one can choose T large enough to ensure that that $S^T x_0 \in \mathcal{W}^s \cap U$. Therefore, the conditions of the following result are met if we use the terminal distribution of Theorem 2 (applied to the initial data given by (2)) as the initial distribution.

Theorem 3. *There are two neighborhoods of the origin* $U \subset U' \subset V$, *two positive numbers* $\delta < \delta'$, *and* C^2 *diffeomorphism* $f : U' \to (-\delta', \delta')^2$, *such that* $f(U) = (-\delta,\delta)^2$ *and the following property holds:*

Suppose $x \in \mathcal{W}^s \cap U$, *and* $(\xi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ *is a family of random variables independent of* W *and convergent in distribution, as* $\epsilon \to 0$, *to* ξ_0, *where* ξ_0 *satisfies* (3) *with respect to* x. *Assume that* $\alpha \in (0,1]$ *and that* X_ϵ *solves* (1) *with initial condition*

$$X_\epsilon(0) = x + \epsilon^\alpha \xi_\epsilon, \tag{5}$$

where ξ_ϵ *satisfies condition* (3) *with respect to* x.

There is also a family of random vectors $(\phi'_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$*, and a family of random variables* $(\psi'_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$*, such that*

$$X_\epsilon(\tau^U_\epsilon) = g(\operatorname{sgn}(\psi'_\epsilon)\delta e_1) + \epsilon^\beta \phi'_\epsilon,$$

where $g = f^{-1}$*,* β *is defined in* (4)*, and the random vector*

$$\Theta'_\epsilon = \left(\psi'_\epsilon, \phi'_\epsilon, \tau^U_\epsilon + \frac{\alpha}{\lambda_+}\ln\epsilon\right)$$

converges in distribution as $\epsilon \to 0$*.*

The notation for Θ'_ϵ and its components is chosen to match the notation involved in the statement of Theorem 1. Random elements ψ'_ϵ,ϕ'_ϵ and the distributional limit of Θ'_ϵ will be described precisely, see (27). Obviously, the symmetry or asymmetry in the limiting distribution of ψ'_ϵ results in the symmetric or asymmetric choice of exit direction so that the exits in the positive and negative directions are equiprobable or not. On the other hand, the limiting distribution of ϕ'_ϵ determining the asymptotics of the exit point can also be symmetric or asymmetric which results in the corresponding features of the random choice of the exit direction at the next saddle point visited by the diffusion.

In Section 5 we prove Theorem 3 using the approach based on normal forms.

The last part of the analysis is devoted to the exit from V along $\mathcal{W}^u$. We need the following statement which is a specific case of the main result of [1].

Theorem 4. *In the setting of Theorem 2, assume additionally that (i)* $q = S^T x \in \partial V$*; (ii) there is no* $t \in [0, T)$ *with* $S^t x \in \partial V$*; (iii)* $b(q)$ *is tranversal (i.e. not tangent) to* ∂V *at* q*. Then*

$$\tau^V_\epsilon \overset{\mathbf{P}}{\to} T, \quad \epsilon \to 0, \tag{6}$$

and

$$\epsilon^{-\alpha}(X_\epsilon(\tau^V_\epsilon) - q) \overset{Law}{\to} \pi\bar{\xi}_0, \quad \epsilon \to 0, \tag{7}$$

where π *denotes the projection along* $b(q)$ *onto the tangent line to* ∂V *at* q*.*

Now Theorem 1 follows from the consecutive application of Theorems 2 through 4 and with the help of the strong Markov property. In fact, in this chain of theorems, the conclusion of Theorem 2 ensures that the conditions of Theorem 3 hold, and the conclusion of the latter ensures that the conditions of Theorem 4 hold. Notice that the total time needed to exit V equals the sum of times described in the three theorems. Notice also that at each step we can compute the limiting initial and terminal distributions explicitly. Theorems 2 and 4 contain the respective formulas in their formulations, and the explicit limiting distribution for Θ'_ϵ of Theorem 3 is computed in (27).

4. Simplifying change of coordinates

In this section we start analyzing the diffusion in the neighborhood of the saddle point. The first step is to find a smooth coordinate change that would simplify the system. This can be done with the help of the theory of normal forms.

Let g be a C^∞ diffeomorphism of a neighborhood of the origin with inverse f. When X_ϵ is close to the origin and belongs to the image of that neighborhood under

g, we can use Itô's formula to see that $Y_\epsilon = f(X_\epsilon)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} dY_\epsilon &= Df(X_\epsilon)dX_\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}[Df(X_\epsilon), X_\epsilon] \\ &= Df(g(Y_\epsilon))b(g(Y_\epsilon))dt + \epsilon\tilde{\sigma}(Y_\epsilon)dW + \epsilon^2\Psi(Y_\epsilon)dt, \end{aligned}$$

for some smooth function $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\tilde{\sigma} = ((Df) \circ g)\,\sigma$. Here D denotes the Jacobian matrix, and the square brackets mean quadratic covariation. Since $Df \circ g = (Dg)^{-1}$, we can rewrite the above SDE as

$$dY_\epsilon = \Big((Dg(Y_\epsilon))^{-1}\, b(g(Y_\epsilon)) + \epsilon^2\Psi(Y_\epsilon) \Big)\, dt + \epsilon\tilde{\sigma}(Y_\epsilon)dW. \tag{8}$$

The idea now is to choose a transformation g (or, equivalently, f) that makes the drift in equation (8) easy to estimate. We are going to use the normal form theory and so we need to recall certain terminology, notation and results from [7] putting them in the (two-dimensional) context of this paper.

A pair of complex numbers $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ is said to be non-resonant if there are no integral relations between them of the form $\lambda_j = \alpha \cdot \lambda$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ is a multi-index with $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \geq 2$. Otherwise, we say that it is resonant. Moreover, a resonant λ is said to be one-resonant if all the resonance relations for λ follow from a single resonance relation. A monomial $x^\alpha e_j = x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} e_j$ is called a resonant monomial of order R if $\alpha \cdot \lambda = \lambda_j$ and $|\alpha| = R$. Normal form theory asserts (see [7],[5]) that for any pair of integers $R \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$, there are two neighborhoods of the origin Ω_f and Ω_g and a C^k-diffeomorphism $f : \Omega_f \to \Omega_g$ with inverse $g : \Omega_g \to \Omega_f$ such that

$$(Dg(y))^{-1}\, b(g(y)) = Ay + P(y) + \mathcal{R}(y), \quad y \in \Omega_g \tag{9}$$

where P is a polynomial containing only resonant monomials of order at most R and $\mathcal{R}(\zeta) = O(|\zeta|^{R+1})$. If λ is non-resonant, then f can be chosen so that both P and $\mathcal{R}$ in (9) are identically zero. Moreover, due to [7, Theorem 3,Section 2], if λ is one-resonant then f can be chosen so that $\mathcal{R}$ in (9) is identically zero. More precisely, if λ is a one-resonant pair, then for any pair of integers $R \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$, there are two neighborhoods of the origin Ω_f and Ω_g and a C^k-diffeomorphism $f : \Omega_f \to \Omega_g$ with inverse $g : \Omega_g \to \Omega_f$ such that

$$(Dg(y))^{-1}\, b(g(y)) = Ay + P(y), \quad y \in \Omega_g, \tag{10}$$

where P is a polynomial that contains only resonant monomials.

Note that $(\lambda_+, -\lambda_-)$ is either non-resonant or one-resonant (resonant cases that are not one-resonant are possible in higher dimensions where pairs of eigenvalues get replaced by vectors of eigenvalues). The non-resonant case (in any dimension) was studied in [2]. In this paper, we extend the analysis of [2] to the non-resonant case, i.e. the one-resonant case, given that we are working in 2 dimensions.

To find all resonant monomials of a given order $r \geq 2$, we have to find all the integer solutions to the two 2×2 systems of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1\lambda_+ - \alpha_2\lambda_- &= \pm\lambda_\pm, \\ \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 &= r. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the power multi-indices of a resonant monomial of order r has to coincide with one of the following:

$$(\alpha_1^+(r), \alpha_2^+(r)) = \frac{1}{\lambda_+ + \lambda_-}(\lambda_+ + r\lambda_-, (r-1)\lambda_+), \tag{11}$$

$$(\alpha_1^-(r), \alpha_2^-(r)) = \frac{1}{\lambda_+ + \lambda_-}((r-1)\lambda_-, r\lambda_+ + \lambda_-), \tag{12}$$

Let us make some elementary observations on integer solutions of these equations for $r \geq 2$.

1. None of the solution indices can be 0. Moreover, neither $\alpha_1^+(r)$ nor $\alpha_2^-(r)$ can be equal to 1.
2. As functions of r, $\alpha_i^\pm(r)$ are increasing.
3. Expressions (11) and (12) cannot be an integer for $r = 2$.
4. The term $P = (P_1, P_2)$ in (10) satisfies $P_1(y) = O(y_1^2|y_2|)$ and $P_2(y) = O(|y_1|y_2^2)$. This observation is a consequence of observations 1 and 3 since they imply that resonant multi-indices have to satisfy $\alpha^+(r) \geq (2,1)$ and $\alpha^-(r) \geq (1,2)$ coordinatewise.
5. If at least one of the coordinates y_1 and y_2 is zero, then $P(y_1, y_2) = 0$. This is a direct consequence of the previous observation.

Given all these considerations, the main theorem of this section is a simple consequence of [7].

Theorem 5. *In the setting described in Section 2, there is a number $\delta' > 0$, a neighborhood of the origin U', and a C^2-diffeomorphism $f : U' \to (-\delta', \delta')$ with inverse $g : (-\delta', \delta')^2 \to U'$ such that the following property holds.*

If $X_\epsilon(0) \in U$, then the stochastic process $Y_\epsilon = (Y_{\epsilon,1}, Y_{\epsilon,2})$ given by

$$Y_\epsilon(t) = f(X_\epsilon(t \wedge \tau_\epsilon^U))$$

satisfies the following system of SDEs up to τ_ϵ^U :

$$dY_{\epsilon,1} = (\lambda_+ Y_{\epsilon,1} + H_1(Y_\epsilon, \epsilon))\,dt + \epsilon\tilde{\sigma}_1(Y_\epsilon)dW \tag{13}$$

$$dY_{\epsilon,2} = (-\lambda_- Y_{\epsilon,2} + H_2(Y_\epsilon, \epsilon))\,dt + \epsilon\tilde{\sigma}_2(Y_\epsilon)dW, \tag{14}$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_i : (-\delta', \delta')^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ are C^1 functions for $i = 1, 2$. The functions H_i are given by $H_i = \hat{H}_i + \epsilon^2\Psi_i$, where $\Psi_i : (-\delta', \delta')^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ are continuous bounded functions, and $\hat{H}_i : (-\delta', \delta')^2 \times [0, \infty)$ are polynomials, so that for some constant $K_1 > 0$ and for any $y \in (-\delta', \delta')^2$,

$$|\hat{H}_1(y)| \leq K_1|y_1|^{\alpha_1^+}|y_2|^{\alpha_2^+},$$

$$|\hat{H}_2(y)| \leq K_1|y_1|^{\alpha_1^-}|y_2|^{\alpha_2^-}.$$

Here, the integer numbers $\alpha_i^\pm$, $i = 1, 2$, are such that (α_1^+, α_2^+) is of the form (11) for some choice of $r = r_1 \geq 3$, and and (α_1^-, α_2^-) is of the form (12) for some choice $r = r_2 \geq 3$. In particular,

$$|H_1(y, \epsilon)| \leq K_1 y_1^2|y_2| + K_2\epsilon^2,$$

$$|H_2(y, \epsilon)| \leq K_1|y_1|y_2^2 + K_2\epsilon^2,$$

for some constants $K_1 > 0$ and $K_2 > 0$.

5. Proof of Theorem 3

In this section we derive Theorem 3 from several auxiliary statements. Their proofs are postponed to later sections.

Theorem 5 allows to work with process $Y_\epsilon = f(X_\epsilon)$ instead of X_ϵ while Y_ϵ stays in $(-\delta', \delta')^2$

If we take $\delta \in (0, \delta')$, then for the initial conditions considered in Theorem 3 and given in (5),

$$\mathbf{P}\{X_\epsilon(0) \in U'\} \to 1, \quad \epsilon \to 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}\{Y_\epsilon(0) \in (-\delta', \delta')^2\} \to 1, \quad \epsilon \to 0.$$

Moreover, denoting $f(x)$ by $y = (0, y_2)$ we can write

$$Y_\epsilon(0) = y + \epsilon^\alpha \chi_\epsilon = (\epsilon^\alpha \chi_{\epsilon,1},\ y_2 + \epsilon^\alpha \chi_{\epsilon,2}), \quad \epsilon > 0,$$

where $\chi_\epsilon = (\chi_{\epsilon,1}, \chi_{\epsilon,2})$ is a random vector convergent in distribution to $\chi_0 = (\chi_{0,1}, \chi_{0,2}) = Df(x)\xi_0$. Due to the hypothesis in Theorem 3, we notice that the distribution of $\chi_{0,1}$ has no atom at 0.

Let us take any $p \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$1 - \frac{\lambda_+}{\lambda_-} < p < \frac{\lambda_-}{\lambda_+ + \lambda_-}, \tag{15}$$

and define the following stopping time:

$$\hat\tau_\epsilon = \inf\{t : |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| = \epsilon^{\alpha p}\}.$$

Up to time $\hat\tau_\epsilon$, the process X_ϵ mostly evolves along the stable manifold $\mathcal{W}^s$. After $\hat\tau_\epsilon$, it evolves mostly along the unstable manifold $\mathcal{W}^u$. Process Y_ϵ evolves accordingly, along the images of $\mathcal{W}^s$ and $\mathcal{W}^u$ coinciding with the coordinate axes.

Let us introduce random variables $\eta_\epsilon^\pm$ via

$$\eta_\epsilon^+ = \epsilon^{-\alpha} e^{-\lambda_+ \hat\tau_\epsilon} Y_{\epsilon,1}(\hat\tau_\epsilon),$$
$$\eta_\epsilon^- = \epsilon^{-\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} Y_{\epsilon,2}(\hat\tau_\epsilon).$$

Also we define the distribution of random vector (η_0^+, η_0^-) via

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_0^+ &= \chi_{0,1} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha=1\}} N^+, \\ \eta_0^- &= |\eta_0^+|^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+} y_2, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where

$$N^+ = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda_- s} \tilde\sigma_1(0, e^{-\lambda_- s} y_2) dW \tag{17}$$

is independent of $\chi_{0,1}$.

Lemma 6. *If the first inequality in* (15) *holds, then*

$$\mathbf{P}\{Y_{\epsilon,1}(\hat\tau_\epsilon) = \epsilon^{\alpha p} \operatorname{sgn} \eta_\epsilon^+\} \to 1, \quad \epsilon \to 0. \tag{18}$$

and

$$\left(\eta_\epsilon^+, \eta_\epsilon^-, \hat\tau_\epsilon + \frac{\alpha}{\lambda_+}(1-p)\log\epsilon\right) \xrightarrow{Law} \left(\eta_0^+, \eta_0^-, -\frac{1}{\lambda_+}\log|\eta_0^+|\right), \quad \epsilon \to 0. \tag{19}$$

We prove this lemma in Section 6. Along with the strong Markov property, it allows to reduce the study of the evolution of Y_ϵ after $\hat\tau_\epsilon$ to studying the solution of system (13)–(14) with initial condition

$$Y_\epsilon(0) = (\epsilon^{\alpha p}\operatorname{sgn}\eta_\epsilon^+, \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}\eta_\epsilon^-), \tag{20}$$

where

$$(\eta_\epsilon^+,\eta_\epsilon^-) \xrightarrow{Law} (\eta_0^+,\eta_0^-), \quad \epsilon\to 0. \tag{21}$$

We denote

$$\tau_\epsilon = \tau_\epsilon(\delta) = \inf\{t\ge 0 : |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| = \delta\}. \tag{22}$$

Our next goal is to describe the behavior of $Y(\tau_\epsilon)$. To that end, we introduce a random variable θ via

$$\theta \overset{Law}{=} \begin{cases} N, & \alpha\lambda_- > \lambda_+, \\ \left(\frac{|\eta_0^+|}{\delta}\right)^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+} y_2 + N, & \alpha\lambda_- = \lambda_+, \\ \left(\frac{|\eta_0^+|}{\delta}\right)^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+} y_2, & \alpha\lambda_- < \lambda_+. \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

where the distribution of N conditioned on η_0^+, on $\{\operatorname{sgn}\eta_0^+ = \pm 1\}$ is centered Gaussian with variance

$$\sigma_\pm = \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{2\lambda_- s}\left|\tilde\sigma_2(\pm\delta e^{\lambda_+ s},0)\right|^2 ds.$$

Let us also recall that β is defined in (4).

Lemma 7. *Consider the solution to system* (13)–(14) *equipped with initial conditions* (20) *satisfying* (21)*. If the second inequality in* (15) *holds, then*

$$\mathbf{P}\{|Y_{\epsilon,1}(\tau_\epsilon)| = \delta\} \to 1, \quad \epsilon\to 0, \tag{24}$$

$$\tau_\epsilon + \frac{\alpha p}{\lambda_+}\log\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} \frac{1}{\lambda_+}\log\delta, \tag{25}$$

$$\epsilon^{-\beta}Y_{\epsilon,2}(\tau_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{Law} \theta. \tag{26}$$

Moreover, if $\beta<1$, then the convergence in probability also holds.

A proof of this lemma is given in Section 7.

Now Theorem 3 follows from Lemmas 6 and 7. In fact, the strong Markov property and (18) imply

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_\epsilon^U = \hat\tau_\epsilon + \tau_\epsilon(\delta)\} \to 1, \quad \epsilon\to 0,$$

so that the asymptotics for τ_ϵ^U is defined by that of $\hat\tau_\epsilon$ and $\tau_\epsilon(\delta)$. It is also clear that one can set $\psi'_\epsilon = \eta_\epsilon^+$, and $\phi'_\epsilon = Dg(\operatorname{sgn}(\eta_\epsilon^+)\delta e_1)Y_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon)$, so that the limiting distribution of Θ'_ϵ is given by

$$\left(\eta_0^+,\ Dg(\operatorname{sgn}(\eta_0^+)\delta e_1)(\theta e_2),\ \frac{1}{\lambda_+}\log\frac{\delta}{|\eta_0^+|}\right), \tag{27}$$

where random variables η_0^+ and θ are defined in (16) and (23)

6. Proof of Lemma 6

In this section we shall prove Lemma 6 using several auxiliary lemmas. We start with some terminology.

Definition 1. Given a family $(\xi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ of random variables or random vectors and a function $h : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ we say that $\xi_\epsilon = O_{\mathbf{P}}(h(\epsilon))$ if for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ distributions of $(\xi_\epsilon/h(\epsilon))_{0<\epsilon<\epsilon_0}$, form a tight family, i.e., for any $\delta > 0$ there is a constant $K_\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{|\xi_\epsilon| > K_\delta h(\epsilon)\right\} < \delta, \quad 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0.$$

Definition 2. A family of random variables or random vectors $(\xi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ is called slowly growing as $\epsilon \to 0$ (or just slowly growing) if $\xi_\epsilon = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{-r})$ for all $r > 0$.

Our first lemma estimates the martingale component of the solution of SDEs (13) and (14). Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} S_\epsilon^+(T) &= \sup_{t\le T}\left|\int_0^t e^{-\lambda_+ s}\tilde\sigma_1(Y_\epsilon(s))dW(s)\right|, \quad T>0,\\ S_\epsilon^-(T) &= \sup_{t\le T}\left|\int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)}\tilde\sigma_2(Y_\epsilon(s))dW(s)\right|, \quad T>0. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8. *Suppose $(\tau_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ is a family of stopping times (w.r.t. the natural filtration of W). Then*

$$S_\epsilon^+(\tau_\epsilon) = O_{\mathbf{P}}(1).$$

If additionally $(\tau_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ is slowly growing, then $S_\epsilon^-(\tau_\epsilon)$ is also slowly growing.

Proof. Both estimates are elementary. The first one is an easy consequence of the martingale property of the stochastic integral involved in the definition of S_ϵ^+, and the BDG inequality (see [8, Theorem 3.3.28]). As for the second one, we notice that the stochastic integral in the definition of S_ϵ^- behaves essentially like an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process, and similar bounds apply. □

Lemma 9. *Suppose Y_ϵ is the solution of equations (13)–(14) with initial conditions given by*

$$Y_{\epsilon,1}(0) = \epsilon^\alpha\chi_{\epsilon,1} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{\epsilon,2}(0) = y_2 + \epsilon^\alpha\chi_{\epsilon,2}, \tag{28}$$

where distributions of random variables $(\chi_{\epsilon,1})_{\epsilon>0}$ and $(\chi_{\epsilon,2})_{\epsilon>0}$ form tight families. Let us fix any $R > 0$ and denote $l_\epsilon = \tau_\epsilon^U \wedge (-\frac{\alpha}{\lambda_+}\log\epsilon + R)$ for $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$\sup_{t\le l_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda t}|Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^\alpha),$$

and the family

$$\left(\epsilon^{-\alpha}\sup_{t\le l_\epsilon}|Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - e^{-\lambda t}(y_2 + \epsilon^\alpha\chi_{\epsilon,2})|\right)_{\epsilon>0}$$

is slowly growing.

Proof. The tightness property implies that without loss of generality we can assume that $|\chi_{\epsilon,1}|, |\chi_{\epsilon,2}| < C$ for some constant $C > 0$ and every $\epsilon > 0$.

Let us fix $\gamma > 0$. We can use Lemma 8 to take $c = c(\gamma/3) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}\{S_\epsilon^+(l_\epsilon) > c\} < \gamma/2,$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}\{S_\epsilon^-(l_\epsilon) > c\epsilon^{-q}\} < \gamma/2,$$

where q is an arbitrary number satisfying $0 < q < \alpha$. Let us introduce a constant $K = (3c) \vee C$ and stopping times

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_+ &= \inf\left\{t \geq 0 : e^{-\lambda_+ t}|Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| \geq 2K\epsilon^\alpha\right\},\\
\beta_- &= \inf\left\{t \geq 0 : |Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - e^{-\lambda_- t}(y_2 + \epsilon^\alpha\chi_{\epsilon,2})| \geq 2K\epsilon^{\alpha-q}\right\},\\
\beta &= \beta_+ \wedge \beta_- \wedge l_\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

We start with an estimate for $Y_{\epsilon,1}$. Duhamel's principle for (13), Theorem 5 and Lemma 8 imply that the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t\leq\beta} e^{-\lambda_+ t}|Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| &\leq \epsilon^\alpha K + K_1\int_0^\beta e^{-\lambda_+ s}Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)^2|Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)|ds + K_2\frac{\epsilon^2}{\lambda_+} + \epsilon S_\epsilon^+(\beta)\\
&\leq \epsilon^\alpha K + K_1\int_0^\beta e^{-\lambda_+ s}Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)^2|Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)|ds + K_2\frac{\epsilon^2}{\lambda_+} + \epsilon\frac{K}{3} \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

holds with probability at least $1-\gamma/2$. We analyze each term in the RHS of equation (29).

Let us start with the integral in (29). For $s \leq \beta$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)^2|Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)| &\leq 4K^2\epsilon^{2\alpha}e^{2\lambda_+ s}\left(|Y_{\epsilon,2}(s) - e^{-\lambda_- s}(y_2 + \epsilon^\alpha\chi_{\epsilon,2})| + e^{-\lambda_- s}|y_2 + \epsilon^\alpha\chi_{\epsilon,2}|\right)\\
&\leq 8K^3\epsilon^{3\alpha-q}e^{2\lambda_+ s} + 4K^2\epsilon^{2\alpha}e^{(2\lambda_+-\lambda_-)s}(|y_2| + \epsilon^\alpha C).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1\int_0^\beta e^{-\lambda_+ s}Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)^2|Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)|ds &\leq \frac{8K^3K_1e^{\lambda_+ R}}{\lambda_+}\epsilon^{2\alpha-q}\\
&\quad + 4K_1K^2\epsilon^{2\alpha}(|y_2| + \epsilon^\alpha C)\int_0^\beta e^{(\lambda_+-\lambda_-)s}ds\\
&\leq K\epsilon^\alpha/12 + 5K_1K^2\epsilon^{2\alpha}|y_2|\int_0^\beta e^{(\lambda_+-\lambda_-)s}ds \tag{30}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. Notice that this is a rough estimate, the constants on the r.h.s. are not optimal but sufficient for our purposes. This also applies to some other estimates in this proof.

Let us estimate the integral on the r.h.s. of (30). When $\lambda_+ > \lambda_-$, the integral is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_+ - \lambda_-}e^{(\lambda_+-\lambda_-)\beta} \leq \frac{e^{(\lambda_+-\lambda_-)R}}{\lambda_+ - \lambda_-}\epsilon^{-\alpha+\alpha\lambda_-/\lambda_+};$$

if $\lambda_+ < \lambda_-$, then the integral on the r.h.s of (30) is bounded by $(\lambda_- - \lambda_+)^{-1}$; if $\lambda_+ = \lambda_-$, then the integral is bounded by $2\alpha\lambda_+^{-1}|\log\epsilon|$. Hence, for some constant $K_{\lambda_+,\lambda_-} > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1\int_0^\beta e^{-\lambda_+ s}Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)^2|Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)|ds &\leq K\epsilon^\alpha/12 + K_{\lambda_+,\lambda_-}\epsilon^{2\alpha-\alpha(1-\lambda_-/\lambda_+)^+}|\log\epsilon|\\
&\leq K\epsilon^\alpha/6. \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

Also, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$K_2\epsilon^2/\lambda_+ + \epsilon K/3 < K\epsilon^\alpha/2. \tag{32}$$

From (29), (31) and (32) we get that for all $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, the event

$$A = \left\{ \sup_{t \le \beta} e^{-\lambda_+ t} |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| \le 5K\epsilon^{\alpha}/3 \right\}$$

is such that $\mathbf{P}(A) > 1 - \gamma/2$.

Let us now consider $Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)$ and denote

$$Z_\epsilon(t) = Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - e^{-\lambda_- t}(y_2 + \epsilon^{\alpha}\chi_{\epsilon,2}).$$

Duhamel's principle for $Y_{\epsilon,2}$, the definition of β, Theorem 5 and Lemma 8 imply that the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t\le\beta} |Z_\epsilon(t)| &\le K_1 \sup_{t\le\beta} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)} |Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)|^{\alpha_1^-} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)|^{\alpha_2^-}\, ds + K_2\epsilon^2/\lambda_- + \epsilon S_\epsilon^-(\beta) \\ &\le K_1 \sup_{t\le\beta} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)} |Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)|^{\alpha_1^-} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)|^{\alpha_2^-}\, ds \\ &\qquad\qquad + \epsilon^{\alpha-q}\left(K_2\epsilon^{2-\alpha+q}/\lambda_- + \epsilon^{1-\alpha+q} S_\epsilon^-(\beta)\right) \\ &\le 2^{\alpha_1^-}\epsilon^{\alpha\alpha_1^-} K^{\alpha_1^-} K_1 \sup_{t\le\beta} e^{-\lambda_- t} \int_0^t e^{(\lambda_- + \alpha_1^-\lambda_+)s} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)|^{\alpha_2^-}\, ds + \epsilon^{\alpha-q}K/2 \qquad (33) \end{aligned}$$

hold with probability at least $1-\gamma/2$ and for all $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. We analyze the integral term in (33). Note that, from the definition of β, and the inequality $(a+b)^r \le 2^{r-1}(a^r + b^r)$ we have that for any $t \le \beta$ and any $\epsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)|^{\alpha_2^-} &\le 2^{\alpha_2^- - 1} Z_\epsilon(t)^{\alpha_2^-} + 2^{\alpha_2^- - 1} e^{-\alpha_2^-\lambda_- t} |y_2 + \epsilon^{\alpha}\chi_{\epsilon,2}|^{\alpha_2^-} \\ &\le 2^{2\alpha_2^- - 1} K^{\alpha_2^-} \epsilon^{(\alpha-q)\alpha_2^-} + 2^{2(\alpha_2^- - 1)} e^{-\alpha_2^-\lambda_- t} |y_2|^{\alpha_2^-} \\ &\qquad\qquad + 2^{2(\alpha_2^- - 1)} \epsilon^{\alpha\alpha_2^-} e^{-\alpha_2^-\lambda_- t} |\chi_{\epsilon,2}|^{\alpha_2^-} \\ &\le \epsilon^{\alpha_2^-(\alpha-q)} 2^{2(\alpha_2^- - 1)} \left(2K^{\alpha_2^-} + \epsilon^{q\alpha_2^-}|\chi_{\epsilon,2}|^{\alpha_2^-}\right) + 2^{2(\alpha_2^- - 1)} e^{-\alpha_2^-\lambda_- t} |y_2|^{\alpha_2^-}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence there is a constant $K_\alpha > 0$ such that

$$|Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)|^{\alpha_2^-} \le \epsilon^{\alpha_2^-(\alpha-q)} K_\alpha + K_\alpha e^{-\alpha_2^-\lambda_- t}, \quad t \le \beta.$$

Using the last inequality, the definition of β, and the fact $\alpha_1^-\lambda_+ - (\alpha_2^- - 1)\lambda_- = 0$ from Theorem 5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\epsilon^{\alpha\alpha_1^-} e^{-\lambda_- t} \int_0^t e^{(\lambda_- + \alpha_1^-\lambda_+)s} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)|^{\alpha_1^-}\, ds \\ &\qquad \le \epsilon^{\alpha(\alpha_1^- + \alpha_2^-)} e^{\lambda_+\alpha_1^-\beta} \frac{K_\alpha \epsilon^{-q\alpha_2^-}}{\lambda_- + \alpha_1^-\lambda_+} + K_\alpha \epsilon^{\alpha\alpha_1^-} \int_0^t e^{(\alpha_1^-\lambda_+ - (\alpha_2^- - 1)\lambda_-)s} ds \\ &\qquad \le \epsilon^{(\alpha-q)\alpha_2^-} \frac{K_\alpha e^{\lambda_+\alpha_1^- R}}{\lambda_- + \alpha_1^-\lambda_+} + K_\alpha \epsilon^{\alpha\alpha_1^-}\beta. \qquad (34) \end{aligned}$$

Again, from Theorem 5 we know that $\alpha_1^- \ge 1$ and $\alpha_2^- \ge 2$ which together with (34) imply that for all $\epsilon > 0$ small enough

$$2^{\alpha_1^-}\epsilon^{\alpha\alpha_1^-} K^{\alpha_1^-} K_1 \sup_{t\le\beta} e^{-\lambda_- t} \int_0^t e^{(\lambda_- + \alpha_1^-\lambda_+)s} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)|^{\alpha_2^-}\, ds \le K\epsilon^{\alpha-q}/6. \qquad (35)$$

Using (35) and (33) we conclude that the event

$$B = \left\{ \sup_{t \le \beta} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - e^{-\lambda_- t}(y_2 + \epsilon^\alpha \chi_{\epsilon,2})| \le 2K\epsilon^{\alpha - q}/3 \right\}$$

is such that $\mathbf{P}(B) \ge 1 - \gamma/2$, for all $\epsilon > 0$ small enough.

The proof will be complete once we show that $\beta = l_\epsilon$ with probability at least $1-\gamma$. The latter is a consequence of the following chain of inequalities that hold for all $\epsilon > 0$ small enough:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}\{\beta_+ \wedge \beta_- \le l_\epsilon\} &\le \mathbf{P}\left(\{\beta_+ \wedge \beta_- \le l_\epsilon\} \cap A \cap B\right) + \mathbf{P}(A^c) + \mathbf{P}(B^c) \\ &\le \mathbf{P}\left(\{\beta_+ \wedge \beta_- \le l_\epsilon\} \cap A \cap B\right) + \gamma \\ &\le \mathbf{P}\left(\{\beta_+ \le \beta_- \wedge l_\epsilon\} \cap A\right) + \mathbf{P}\left(\{\beta_- \le \beta_+ \wedge l_\epsilon\} \cap B\right) + \gamma \\ &= \mathbf{P}\{2 \le 5/3\} + \mathbf{P}\{2 \le 2/3\} + \gamma = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

□

Let us now analyze the evolution of the process Y_ϵ up to time $\hat{\tau}_\epsilon \wedge \tau_\epsilon^U$. We start with an application of Duhamel's principle:

$$Y_{\epsilon,1}(t) = e^{\lambda_+ t} Y_{\epsilon,1}(0) + \int_0^t e^{\lambda_+(t-s)} H_1(Y_\epsilon(s), \epsilon) ds + \epsilon e^{\lambda_+ t} N_\epsilon^+(t), \tag{36}$$

$$Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) = e^{-\lambda_- t} Y_{\epsilon,2}(0) + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)} H_2(Y_\epsilon(s), \epsilon) ds + \epsilon N_\epsilon^-(t), \tag{37}$$

where $N_\epsilon^\pm(t)$ are defined by

$$N_\epsilon^+(t) = \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_+ s} \tilde{\sigma}_1(Y_\epsilon(s)) dW(s),$$

$$N_\epsilon^-(t) = \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)} \tilde{\sigma}_2(Y_\epsilon(s)) dW(s). \tag{38}$$

Lemma 10.

$$\sup_{t \le \hat{\tau}_\epsilon} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - e^{-\lambda_- t} y_2| = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{\alpha p}).$$

Proof. Duhamel's princinple, Theorem 5, and the definition of $\hat{\tau}_\epsilon$ imply that for some $K > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}|Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - e^{-\lambda_- t} y_2| &\le \epsilon^\alpha |\chi_{\epsilon,2}| + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)} \left(K_1 |Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)| Y_{\epsilon,2}^2(s) + K_2 \epsilon^2\right) ds + \epsilon S_\epsilon^-(t) \\ &\le \epsilon^\alpha |\chi_{\epsilon,2}| + K\epsilon^{\alpha p} + \epsilon^{\alpha p}\left(\epsilon^{1-\alpha p} S_\epsilon^-(\hat{\tau}_\epsilon)\right)\end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in (0, \hat{\tau}_\epsilon)$. The result follows since by Lemma 8 the r.h.s. is $O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{\alpha p})$ □

As a simple corollary of this lemma, the first statement in Theorem 6 follows:

Corollary 11. *As $\epsilon \to 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_\epsilon^U < \hat{\tau}_\epsilon\} \to 0.$$

In particular, (18) *holds true.*

Lemma 12. *Let*

$$N_0^+(t) = \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_- s}\tilde{\sigma}_1(0, e^{-\lambda_- s}y_2)dW.$$

Then

$$\sup_{t\le\hat{\tau}_\epsilon} |N_\epsilon^+(t) - N_0^+(t)| \xrightarrow{L^2} 0, \quad \epsilon \to 0.$$

Proof. BDG inequality implies that for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le\hat{\tau}_\epsilon} |N_\epsilon^+(t) - N_0^+(t)|^2 &\le C_1\mathbf{E}\int_0^{\hat{\tau}_\epsilon} e^{-2\lambda_+ s}|\tilde{\sigma}_1(Y_{\epsilon,1}(s), Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)) - (0, e^{-\lambda_- s}y_2)|^2 ds \\ &\le C_2\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le\hat{\tau}_\epsilon} |\tilde{\sigma}_1(Y_{\epsilon,1}(s), Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)) - \tilde{\sigma}_1(0, e^{-\lambda_- s}y_2)|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

From Lemma 10 and the definition of $\hat{\tau}_\epsilon$, it follows that

$$\sup_{t\le\hat{\tau}_\epsilon} \left|(Y_{\epsilon,1}(t), Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)) - (0, e^{-\lambda_- t}y_2)\right| = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{\alpha p}). \tag{40}$$

The desired convergence follows now from (39), (40), and the boundedness and Lipschitzness of $\tilde{\sigma}_1$. □

We are now in position to give the first rough asymptotics for the time $\hat{\tau}_\epsilon$. From now on we restrict ourselves to the event $\{\tau_\epsilon^U > \hat{\tau}_\epsilon\}$ since due to Corollary 11 its probability is arbitrarily high.

Lemma 13. *As* $\epsilon \to 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\hat{\tau}_\epsilon > -\frac{\alpha}{\lambda_+}\log\epsilon\right\} \to 0.$$

Proof. Let u_ϵ be the solution to the following SDE:

$$\begin{aligned} du_\epsilon(t) &= \lambda_+ u_\epsilon(t)dt + \epsilon\tilde{\sigma}_1(Y_\epsilon(t))dW(t), \\ u_\epsilon(0) &= \epsilon^\alpha\chi_{\epsilon,1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us take $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ to be specified later and consider the following stopping time

$$\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon = \inf\left\{t : |u_\epsilon(t)| = \epsilon^{\alpha\delta_0}\right\}.$$

Duhamel's principle for u_ϵ writes as

$$\begin{aligned} u_\epsilon(t) &= \epsilon^\alpha e^{\lambda_+ t}\chi_{\epsilon,1} + \epsilon e^{\lambda_+ t}N_\epsilon^+(t) \\ &= \epsilon^\alpha e^{\lambda_+ t}\widetilde{\eta}_\epsilon(t), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\widetilde{\eta}_\epsilon(t) = \chi_{\epsilon,1} + \epsilon^{1-\alpha}N_\epsilon^+(t). \tag{41}$$

Hence, the definition of $\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon$ implies $\epsilon^{\alpha\delta_0} = \epsilon^\alpha e^{\lambda_+\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon}|\widetilde{\eta}_\epsilon(\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon)|$, so that

$$\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon = -\frac{\alpha}{\lambda_+}(1-\delta_0)\log\epsilon - \frac{1}{\lambda_+}\log|\widetilde{\eta}_\epsilon(\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon)|.$$

Due to (41) and Lemma 12, the distributions of $\frac{1}{\lambda_+}\log|\widetilde{\eta}_\epsilon(\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon)|$ form a tight family. Therefore,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\mathbf{P}\left\{\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon > -(1-\delta_0^2)\frac{\alpha}{\lambda_+}\log\epsilon\right\} = 0. \tag{42}$$

This fact allows us to use Lemma 9 to estimate Y_ϵ up to $\hat{\tau}_\epsilon \wedge \widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon$. From (36), the difference $\Delta_\epsilon = Y_{\epsilon,1} - u_\epsilon$ is given by

$$\Delta_\epsilon(t) = e^{\lambda_+ t} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_+ s} H_1(Y_\epsilon(s), \epsilon) ds.$$

We can use (42) to justify the application of Lemma 9 up to time $\hat{\tau}_\epsilon \wedge \widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon$. Then, we combine Theorem 5, Lemma 9, and the definition of $\hat{\tau}_\epsilon$ to see that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t \le \hat{\tau}_\epsilon \wedge \widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_+ t} |H_1(Y_\epsilon(t), \epsilon)| &\le K_1 \sup_{t \le \hat{\tau}_\epsilon \wedge \widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon} \left(\left(e^{-\lambda_+ t} |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| \right) |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| \cdot |Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)| \right) + K_2 \epsilon^2 \\ &= O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\epsilon^{\alpha + \alpha p} \right)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$e^{\lambda_+ \hat{\tau}_\epsilon \wedge \widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon} = O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\epsilon^{-\alpha(1-\delta_0^2)} \right).$$

These two estimates together with (42) imply

$$\sup_{t \le \hat{\tau}_\epsilon \wedge \widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon} |\Delta_\epsilon(t)| = O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\epsilon^{\alpha(p+\delta_0^2)} |\log \epsilon| \right).$$

On one hand, (42) implies

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\left\{ \hat{\tau}_\epsilon > -\frac{\alpha}{\lambda_+} \log \epsilon \right\} \cap \{ \hat{\tau}_\epsilon \le \widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon \} \right) \to 0.$$

On the other hand, if $\hat{\tau}_\epsilon > \widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon$ then

$$|Y_{\epsilon,1}(\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon)| = \left| \epsilon^{\alpha \delta_0} + O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{\alpha(p+\delta_0^2)} |\log \epsilon|) \right|,$$

and

$$|Y_{\epsilon,1}(\widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon)| < \epsilon^{\alpha p}.$$

These relations contradict each other for sufficiently small ϵ if we choose $\delta_0 < p$. So, this choice of δ_0 guarantees that $\mathbf{P}\{\hat{\tau}_\epsilon > \widetilde{\tau}_\epsilon\} \to 0$ implying the result. □

Proof of Lemma 6. Recall that we work on the high probability event $\{\hat{\tau}_\epsilon < \tau_\epsilon^U\}$. Hence, for each $\epsilon > 0$, we have the identity

$$\epsilon^{\alpha p} = \epsilon^\alpha e^{\lambda_+ \hat{\tau}_\epsilon} |\eta_\epsilon^+|.$$

Solving for $\hat{\tau}_\epsilon$ and then plugging it back into $Y_{\epsilon,1}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tau}_\epsilon &= -\frac{\alpha}{\lambda_+}(1-p) \log \epsilon - \frac{1}{\lambda_+} \log |\eta_\epsilon^+|, \qquad (43) \\ Y_{\epsilon,1}(\hat{\tau}_\epsilon) &= \epsilon^{\alpha p} \operatorname{sgn}(\eta_\epsilon^+).\end{aligned}$$

Using this information we are in position to get the asymptotic behavior of the random variables $\eta_\epsilon^\pm$. First, from relation (36) we get

$$\eta_\epsilon^+ = \chi_{\epsilon,1} + \epsilon^{-\alpha} \int_0^{\hat{\tau}_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_+ s} H_1(Y_\epsilon(s), \epsilon) ds + \epsilon^{1-\alpha} N_\epsilon^+(\hat{\tau}_\epsilon). \qquad (44)$$

Using (43) in (37) we get

$$\eta_\epsilon^- = |\eta_\epsilon^+|^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+}(y_2 + \epsilon^\alpha \chi_{\epsilon,2}) + |\eta_\epsilon^+|^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+} \int_0^{\hat\tau_\epsilon} e^{\lambda_- s} H_2(Y_\epsilon(s),\epsilon)ds \\ + \epsilon^{1-\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} N_\epsilon^-(\hat\tau_\epsilon). \tag{45}$$

The main part of the proof is based on representations (43)–(45).

Lemma 13 allows us to use the estimates established in Lemma 9 up to time $\hat\tau_\epsilon$. In particular, now we can conclude that the family

$$\left(\epsilon^{-\alpha} \sup_{t\le\hat\tau_\epsilon} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - e^{-\lambda_- t} y_2|\right)_{\epsilon>0} \tag{46}$$

is slowly growing thus improving Lemma 10.

To obtain the desired convergence for η_ϵ^+, we analyze the r.h.s. of (44) term by term. The covergence of the first term was one of our assumptions. For the second one, we need to estimate $H_1(Y_\epsilon,\epsilon)$. Using Lemma 9, the boundness of $Y_{\epsilon,2}$ and the definition of $\hat\tau_\epsilon$, we see that

$$\sup_{t\le\hat\tau_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_+ t} Y_{\epsilon,1}^2(t)|Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)| = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{\alpha+\alpha p}). \tag{47}$$

This estimate and Theorem 5 imply that

$$\epsilon^{-\alpha}\int_0^{\hat\tau_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_+ s} H_1(Y_\epsilon(s),\epsilon)ds \le K_1\epsilon^{-\alpha}\int_0^{\hat\tau_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_+ s} Y_{\epsilon,1}^2(s)|Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)|ds + \frac{K_2}{\lambda_+}\epsilon^{2-\alpha} \\ = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{\alpha p}|\log\epsilon|).$$

Let us estimate the third term in (44). We can use the last estimate along with (44) and Lemma 12 to conclude that the distributions of positive part of $\lambda_+^{-1}\log|\eta_\epsilon^+|$ form a tight family. Therefore, (43) implies that

$$\hat\tau_\epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} \infty, \quad \epsilon\to 0.$$

Combined with Itô isometry and Lemma 12, this implies

$$N_\epsilon^+(\hat\tau_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{L^2} N^+, \quad \epsilon \to 0,$$

which completes the analysis of η_ϵ^+ and, due to (43), of $\hat\tau_\epsilon$.

To obtain the convergence of η_ϵ^-, we study (45). Combining (46), the inequality

$$|Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)|Y_{\epsilon,2}^2(t) \le 2|Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)|\left(|Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - e^{-\lambda_- t}y_2|^2 + e^{-2\lambda_- t}y_2^2\right),$$

and the definition of $\hat\tau_\epsilon$ we see that for any $q\in(0,\alpha p)$,

$$\sup_{t\le\hat\tau_\epsilon} e^{\lambda_- t}|Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)|Y_{\epsilon,2}^2(t) = O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\epsilon^{\alpha p+\alpha-q}e^{\lambda_-\hat\tau_\epsilon} + \epsilon^{\alpha p}\right).$$

Hence, as a consequence of Theorem 5 and (43) we have

$$\int_0^{\hat\tau_\epsilon} e^{\lambda_- s}H_2(Y_\epsilon(s),\epsilon)ds = O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\left(\epsilon^{\alpha p-q+\alpha}e^{\lambda_-\hat\tau_\epsilon} + \epsilon^{\alpha p}\right)|\log\epsilon|\right) \\ = O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\left(\epsilon^{\alpha(1-(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+)+(\alpha p-q)} + \epsilon^{\alpha p}\right)|\log\epsilon|\right).$$

Combining this and Lemma 8 in (45) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_\epsilon^- &= |\eta_\epsilon^+|^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+} y_2 + O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^\alpha) + O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\left(\epsilon^{\alpha(1-(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+)+(\alpha p-q)} + \epsilon^{\alpha p}\right)|\log\epsilon|\right)\\ &\quad + O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\epsilon^{1-\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+-q}\right)\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of Lemma 6 by choosing q small enough. ☐

7. Proof of Lemma 7

Consider the solution to system (13)–(14) equipped with initial conditions (20) satisfying (21). Let us restrict the analysis to the arbitrary high probability event

$$\{|\eta_\epsilon^\pm| \le K_\pm\},$$

for some constants $K_\pm > 0$.

Lemma 14. *Let $p \in (0,1)$ satisfy (15), and let $(t_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ be a slowly growing family of stopping times. Consider $t'_\epsilon = t_\epsilon \wedge \tau_\epsilon^U$, then for any $\gamma > 0$,*

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\mathbf{P}\left\{\sup_{t\le t'_\epsilon}|Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)| \le (K_- + \gamma)\epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}\right\} = 1.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma > 0$. We recall that N_ϵ^- is defined in (38) and introduce the process

$$M_\epsilon(t) = N_\epsilon^-(t) + \epsilon\int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)}\Psi_2(Y_\epsilon(s))ds, \tag{48}$$

where Ψ_2 was introduced in Theorem 5, and the stopping time

$$\beta_\epsilon = \inf\left\{t : |Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)| > (K_- + \gamma)\epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}\right\}.$$

Using the fact that $Y_{\epsilon,1}$ is bounded, it is easy to see that there is a constant K_{λ_-} independent of t, so that for any $t \le \beta_\epsilon \wedge t'_\epsilon$, we have

$$\int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)}|Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)|Y_{\epsilon,2}^2(s)ds \le K_{\lambda_-}\epsilon^{2\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}.$$

This estimate, along with Duhamel's principle and Theorem 5 implies that for some constant $C > 0$ and any $t \le \beta_\epsilon \wedge t'_\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}|Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)| &\le \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}|\eta_\epsilon^-| + K_1\int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)}|Y_{\epsilon,1}(s)|Y_{\epsilon,2}^2(s)ds + \epsilon\sup_{t\le\beta_\epsilon}|M_\epsilon(t)|\\ &\le \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}K_- + C\epsilon^{2\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} + \epsilon\sup_{t\le\beta_\epsilon}|M_\epsilon(t)|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using Lemma 8 to estimate M_ϵ, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}\{\beta_\epsilon < t'_\epsilon\} &= \mathbf{P}\left\{\sup_{t\le\beta_\epsilon\wedge t'_\epsilon}|Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)| \ge (K_- + \gamma)\epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}\right\}\\ &\le \mathbf{P}\left\{C\epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} + \epsilon^{1-\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}\sup_{t\le\beta_\epsilon}|M_\epsilon(t)| \ge \gamma\right\}\end{aligned}$$

converges to 0 as $\epsilon \to 0$ proving the lemma. ☐

Lemma 15. *Under the assumptions of lemma 14, for any* $\rho \in (0, \frac{\alpha p}{\lambda_+}]$, $\gamma > 0$, *and* $C > 0$, *define* $\rho_\epsilon = (-\rho \log \epsilon + C) \wedge \tau^U_\epsilon$. *Then, we have*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sup_{t \le \rho_\epsilon} |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| e^{-\lambda_+ t} \le (1+\gamma)\epsilon^{\alpha p} \right\} = 1.$$

Proof. Define the stopping time

$$\beta_\epsilon = \inf \left\{ t : |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| e^{-\lambda_+ t} \ge (1+\gamma)\epsilon^{\alpha p} \right\}.$$

As a consequence of Duhamel's principle and Theorem 5 we get the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \le \beta_\epsilon \wedge \rho_\epsilon} |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| e^{-\lambda_+ t} \le & \epsilon^{\alpha p} + K_1 \int_0^{\beta_\epsilon \wedge \rho_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_+ s} Y^2_{\epsilon,1}(s) |Y_{\epsilon,2}(s)| ds \\ & + \epsilon^2 K_2 \lambda_+^{-1} + \epsilon S^+_\epsilon(\beta_\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

This estimate together with Lemma 14, Lemma 8 and the defintion of ρ_ϵ implies that for any small $\delta > 0$ we can find a constant $K > 0$, so that with probability bigger than $1 - \delta$, the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \le \beta_\epsilon \wedge \rho_\epsilon} |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| e^{-\lambda_+ t} & \le \epsilon^{\alpha p} + K \epsilon^{\alpha p + \alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} (\beta_\epsilon \wedge \rho_\epsilon) + K\epsilon \\ & \le \epsilon^{\alpha p} (1 + 2K\rho \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} |\log \epsilon| + K \epsilon^{1-\alpha p}), \end{aligned}$$

hold for all $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. Hence, for any small enough $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{\beta_\epsilon < \rho_\epsilon\} &= \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sup_{t \le \beta_\epsilon \wedge \rho_\epsilon} |Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)| e^{-\lambda_+ t} \ge (1+\gamma)\epsilon^{\alpha p} \right\} \\ & \le \mathbf{P} \left\{ K\rho \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} |\log \epsilon| + K \epsilon^{1-\alpha p} \ge \gamma \right\} + \delta, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the result. □

The following is an important consequence of Lemma 14:

Corollary 16. *With* τ_ϵ *as in* (22) *it holds that*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathbf{P}\{\tau^U_\epsilon < \tau_\epsilon\} = 0.$$

In particular, (24) *holds.*

From now on, we restrict our analysis to the high probability event $\{\tau^U_\epsilon \ge \tau_\epsilon\}$.

Let $\theta^+_\epsilon = \epsilon^{-\alpha p} e^{-\lambda_+ \tau_\epsilon} Y_{\epsilon,1}(\tau_\epsilon)$. Then, (22) implies

$$\tau_\epsilon = -\frac{\alpha p}{\lambda_+} \log \epsilon + \frac{1}{\lambda_+} \log \frac{\delta}{|\theta^+_\epsilon|}, \tag{49}$$

and

$$Y_{\epsilon,1}(\tau_\epsilon) = \delta \, \mathrm{sgn}\, \theta^+_\epsilon.$$

Our analysis of these expressions will be based on the next formula which directly follows from Duhamel's principle:

$$\theta^+_\epsilon = \mathrm{sgn}\, \eta^+_\epsilon + \epsilon^{-\alpha p} \int_0^{\tau_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_+ s} H_1(Y_\epsilon(s), \epsilon) ds + \epsilon^{1-\alpha p} N^+_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon). \tag{50}$$

The main term in the r.h.s. of (50) is $\mathrm{sgn}\, \eta^+_\epsilon$. We need to estimate the other two terms. Lemma 8 implies that $\epsilon^{1-\alpha p} N^+_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon)$ converges to 0 in probability as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Let us now estimate the integral term. Relations (49) and (50) imply that $(\tau_\epsilon)_{\epsilon>0}$ is slowly growing, and we can use Lemma 14 to derive

$$\sup_{t\le\tau_\epsilon}|Y_{\epsilon,2}(t)| = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}). \tag{51}$$

We can now use Theorem 5 to conclude that

$$\epsilon^{-\alpha p}\sup_{t\le\tau_\epsilon}|H_1(Y_\epsilon(t),\epsilon)| = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+-\alpha p}+\epsilon^{2-\alpha p}),$$

and (15) implies that the r.h.s. converges to 0. Therefore,

$$\epsilon^{-\alpha p}\int_0^{\tau_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_+ s}H_1(Y_\epsilon(s),\epsilon)ds \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 0.$$

The above analysis of equation (50) implies that if we define $\theta_0^+ = \operatorname{sgn}\eta_0^+$, then

$$\theta_\epsilon^+ \xrightarrow{Law} \theta_0^+, \tag{52}$$

which implies (25) due to (49). It remains to prove (26).

Duhamel's principle along with (49) yields

$$Y_{\epsilon,2}(\tau_\epsilon) = \left(\frac{|\theta_\epsilon^+|}{\delta}\right)^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+}\epsilon^{\alpha\lambda_-/\lambda_+}\eta_\epsilon^- + \int_0^{\tau_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_-(\tau_\epsilon-s)}H_2(Y_\epsilon(s),\epsilon)ds + \epsilon N_\epsilon^-(\tau_\epsilon). \tag{53}$$

In order to study the convergence of $N_\epsilon^-(\tau_\epsilon)$ we first give a preliminary result.

Lemma 17.

$$\sup_{t\le\tau_\epsilon}|Y_{\epsilon,1}(t)-\epsilon^{\alpha p}e^{\lambda_+ t}\operatorname{sgn}\eta_\epsilon^+| \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 0, \quad \epsilon\to 0.$$

Proof. The lemma follows from Duhamel's principle and Lemma 15. ☐

The following result is essentially Lemma 8.9 from [2]. It holds true in our setting since its proof is based only on the conclusion of Lemma 17.

Lemma 18. *As* $\epsilon\to 0$,

$$N_\epsilon^-(\tau_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{Law} N,$$

where N *is the Gaussian random variable in* (23).

We finish the proof of Lemma 7. Recall that the process M_ϵ was defined in (48) and introduce the stochastic processes

$$R_\epsilon(t) = \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)}\hat{H}_2(Y_\epsilon(s))ds. \tag{54}$$

Note that (53) and (49) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\epsilon,2}(\tau_\epsilon) &= e^{-\lambda_-\tau_\epsilon}Y_{\epsilon,2}(0) + \int_0^{\tau_\epsilon} e^{-\lambda_-(\tau_\epsilon-s)}H_2(Y_\epsilon(s),\epsilon)ds + \epsilon N_\epsilon^-(\tau_\epsilon)\\
&= e^{-\lambda_-\tau_\epsilon}\epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}\eta_\epsilon^- + \epsilon M_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon) + R_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon)\\
&= \eta_\epsilon^-\left(\frac{|\theta_\epsilon^+|}{\delta}\right)^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+}\epsilon^{\alpha\lambda_-/\lambda_+} + \epsilon M_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon) + R_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon).
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Relations (21) and (52) imply

$$\eta_\epsilon^-\left(\frac{|\theta_\epsilon^+|}{\delta}\right)^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+} \xrightarrow{Law} \left(\frac{|\eta_0^+|}{\delta}\right)^{\lambda_-/\lambda_+} y_2. \tag{56}$$

Lemma 18 and estimate (51) imply

$$M_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{Law} N, \quad \epsilon \to 0. \tag{57}$$

Equations (56) and (57) describe the behavior of first two terms in (55) and the proof of the lemma will be complete as soon as we show that

$$\epsilon^{-\beta} R_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 0, \quad \epsilon \to 0. \tag{58}$$

We can write the following rough estimate based on (51) and Theorem 5:

$$\sup_{t \le \tau_\epsilon} |R_\epsilon(t)| = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{2\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}). \tag{59}$$

This is not sufficient for our purposes. We shall need a more detailed analysis instead. First, note that

$$\sup_{t \le \tau_\epsilon} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - \epsilon M_\epsilon(t) - R_\epsilon(t)| e^{\lambda_- t} = \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} |\eta_\epsilon^-| = O_{\mathbf{P}}(\epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}).$$

Hence, for any $\gamma > 0$ there is a $K_\gamma > 0$ such that the event

$$D_\epsilon = \left\{ \sup_{t \le \tau_\epsilon} |Y_{\epsilon,2}(t) - \epsilon M_\epsilon(t) - R_\epsilon(t)| e^{\lambda_- t} < K_\gamma \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} \right\}$$

has probability $\mathbf{P}(D_\epsilon) > 1 - \gamma$ for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. Moreover, using Theorem 5 we see that for some constant $K_\beta > 0$,

$$|R_\epsilon(t)| \le K_\beta \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)} Y_{\epsilon,2}^2(s) ds.$$

Then, using the inequality $(a-b)^2 \le 2a^2 + 2b^2$ and defining $K_{\beta,\gamma} = K_\beta K_\gamma$, we see that on D_ϵ for each $t \le \tau_\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} |R_\epsilon(t)| &\le K_\beta e^{-\lambda_- t} \int_0^t (e^{\lambda_- s} Y_{\epsilon,2}(s))^2 e^{-\lambda_- s} ds \\ &\le 2K_{\beta,\gamma} e^{-\lambda_- t} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_- s} \epsilon^{2\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} ds + 2K_\beta \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_-(t-s)} |\epsilon M_\epsilon(s) + R_\epsilon(s)|^2 ds \\ &\le 2\frac{K_{\beta,\gamma}}{\lambda_-} \epsilon^{2\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} e^{-\lambda_- t} + 4\frac{K_\beta}{\lambda_-} \epsilon^2 M_{\epsilon,\infty}^2 + 4K_\beta e^{-\lambda_- t} \int_0^t e^{\lambda_- s} R_\epsilon(s)^2 ds, \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where $M_{\epsilon,\infty} = \sup_{t \le \tau_\epsilon} |M_\epsilon(t)|$, so that (according to Lemma 8) $M_{\epsilon,\infty}$ is slowly growing. Due to (59) we can find a constant $K'_\gamma > 0$ (independent of $\epsilon > 0$ and $t > 0$) so that the event

$$D'_\epsilon = D_\epsilon \cap \left\{ \sup_{t \le \tau_\epsilon} |R_\epsilon(t)| \le K'_\gamma \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} \right\}$$

has probability $\mathbf{P}(D'_\epsilon) > 1 - \gamma$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. Hence, multiplying both sides of (60) by $e^{\lambda_- t}$, we see that for some constant $C_\gamma > 0$ and all $t \le \tau_\epsilon$,

$$e^{\lambda_- t} |R_\epsilon(t)| \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}'_\epsilon} \le \alpha(t) + C_\gamma \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} \int_0^t e^{\lambda_- s} |R_\epsilon(s)| \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}'_\epsilon} ds,$$

where

$$\alpha(t) = C_\gamma \epsilon^{2\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} + C_\gamma \epsilon^2 M_{\epsilon,\infty}^2 e^{\lambda_- t}. \tag{61}$$

Using Gronwall's lemma and (61) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}'_\epsilon} e^{\lambda_- t}|R_\epsilon(t)| &\leq \alpha(t) + C_\gamma \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} \int_0^t \alpha(s) e^{C_\gamma \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}(t-s)} ds \\ &\leq \alpha(t) + C_\gamma^2 \epsilon^{3\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} t e^{C_\gamma \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} t} \\ &\quad + \frac{C_\gamma^2}{\lambda_-} \epsilon^{2+\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} M_{\epsilon,\infty}^2 t e^{\lambda_- t + C_\gamma \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}'_\epsilon}|R_\epsilon(t)| &\leq C_\gamma \epsilon^{2\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} e^{-\lambda_- t}(1 + C_\gamma \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} t e^{C_\gamma \epsilon^{2\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} t}) \\ &\quad + C_\gamma \epsilon^2 M_{\epsilon,\infty}^2 (1 + \frac{C_\gamma}{\lambda_-} \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} t e^{C_\gamma \epsilon^{\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+}}).\end{aligned}$$

Using (49), we get that for any $q > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}'_\epsilon}|R_\epsilon(\tau_\epsilon)| &= O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\epsilon^{2\alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} e^{-\lambda_- \tau_\epsilon} + \epsilon^2 M_{\epsilon,\infty}^2\right) \\ &= O_{\mathbf{P}}\left(\epsilon^{\alpha\lambda_-/\lambda_+ + \alpha(1-p)\lambda_-/\lambda_+} + \epsilon^{2-q}\right),\end{aligned}$$

so that (58) follows, and the proof is complete by choosing q small enough.

REFERENCES

[1] Sergio Angel Almada Monter and Yuri Bakhtin. Scaling limit for the diffusion exit problem in the Levinson case. *Submitted to Stoch. Process. Appl.; also available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1006.2766.*

[2] Yuri Bakhtin. Noisy heteroclinic networks. *Probability Theory and Related Fields, in print; also available at http://arxiv.org/abs/0712.3952.*

[3] Yuri Bakhtin. Exit asymptotics for small diffusion about an unstable equilibrium. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 118(5):839–851, 2008.

[4] Yuri Bakhtin. Small noise limit for diffusions near heteroclinic networks. *Dynamical Systems, in print*, 2010.

[5] Shui-Nee Chow, Cheng Zhi Li, and Duo Wang. *Normal forms and bifurcation of planar vector fields.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.

[6] M. I. Freidlin and A. D. Wentzell. *Random perturbations of dynamical systems*, volume 260 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences].* Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998. Translated from the 1979 Russian original by Joseph Szücs.

[7] Yu. S. Il′yashenko and S. Yu. Yakovenko. Finitely smooth normal forms of local families of diffeomorphisms and vector fields. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 46(1(277)):3–39, 240, 1991.

[8] Ioannis Karatzas and Steven E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.

[9] Yuri Kifer. The exit problem for small random perturbations of dynamical systems with a hyperbolic fixed point. *Israel J. Math.*, 40(1):74–96, 1981.

[10] Lawrence Perko. *Differential equations and dynamical systems*, volume 7 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics.* Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 2001.

[11] Mikhail I. Rabinovich, Ramón Huerta, Pablo Varona, and Valentin S. Afraimovich. Transient cognitive dynamics, metastability, and decision making. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 4(5):e1000072, 9, 2008.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, GEORGIA TECH, ATLANTA GA, 30332-0160, USA
E-mail address: `salmada3@math.gatech.edu, bakhtin@math.gatech.edu`